



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/537,294	03/29/2000	Yoshio Morikawa	325772016800	7129

25227 7590 05/27/2005

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/537,294

Applicant(s)

MORIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005 and 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2000 and 20 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amended title filed on 9/20/2004 has been accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibusawa (US 6,088,120) in view of Shiohara (US 6,804,019).

Regarding claim 31: Shibusawa teaches a printing system (fig. 1) comprising: a plurality of data processing apparatuses (4a, 4b, fig. 1) for transmitting a printing job data; a plurality of printing apparatuses (2a, 2b, fig. 1) for printing based on the printing job data received from any one of the data processing apparatuses and each printing apparatus has apparatus information including at least a printer language (column 6, lines 35-45) to be acquired by the printing apparatus; a network line (column 4, line 4) for connecting between the plurality of data processing apparatuses and the plurality of printing apparatuses; and a controller (1, fig. 1) for acquiring printing information from the plurality of printing apparatuses and for grouping at least two of the plurality of printing apparatuses based on the printer language information (column 6, lines 35-53).

Shibusawa specified the printing apparatus sending apparatus information.

Shiohara, in the same area of printing using different functions of a printer, teaches printing apparatus function information can be acquired by a computer by having the printing apparatus sending the apparatus function information to the computer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shibusawa's printing apparatus to include: the printing apparatus sending apparatus information.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shibusawa's printing apparatus by the teaching of Shiohara because: (a) it would allowed the controller of Shibusawa to acquire the most updated printer's function, and (b) it is the most direct and easy way of obtaining printers information when the controller and the printers are far apart.

3. Claims 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibusawa (US 6,088,120) in view of Shiohara (US 6,804,019) as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Kopecki (US 6,577,407).

Regarding claims 32, 33: Shibusawa teaches does not teach wherein the controller designates a managing printing apparatus selected from the printing language group/based on the printer language information.

Kopecki, in the same area of managing printers, teaches designating a managing printing apparatus among printers that is having the same printer language (column 2, lines 52-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the print system of Shibusawa to include: wherein the controller of the managing printing apparatus designates a managing printing apparatus selected from the printing language group/based on the

Art Unit: 2624

printing language group (such that the printer can be used to translate print job for other printers using the same language, column 2, lines 52-62 of Kopecki).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shibusawa's printing apparatus by the teaching of Kopecki because: it would have created a lower cost system with efficient use of printers as taught by Kopecki at column 2, lines 10-15, column 1, lines 34-36.

Regarding claims 34: Shibusawa/Kopecki teaches wherein the controller designates the managing printing apparatus by input from a user interface.

Since both system of Shibusawa / Kopecki are created by human and control by programs, it is inherent that a user interface must exist such that a human can enter/create the original control program such that the system would function as taught by Shibusawa and Kopecki.

Regarding claim 35: Shibusawa teaches wherein the controller notifies the managing printing apparatus of printing apparatuses which are not the managing printing apparatus via the network line (column 9, lines 50-55, column 5, lines 55-61).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see remarks on page 23- 25 of amendment, filed 9/20/2004, with respect to claims 1-26 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-30 are allowed.
6. Claims 36 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2624

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (571) 272-7440

5/25/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'King Y. Poon'.

**KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**